arXiv:1212.1197v1 [math.PR] 5 Dec 2012

INHOMOGENEOUS AND COUPLED CONTINUOUS TIME RANDOM WALK LIMITS

PETER STRAKA

Abstract. We study stochastic process limits of Continuous Time Random Walks (CTRWs) whose jumps and waiting times vary in both time and space and are possibly coupled. We prove limit theorems for the weak convergence in Skorokhod space of càdlàg paths. In the case of coupled waiting times and jumps, there exist two different limit processes. These limit processes are then characterized via a tuple of coefficients, which is derived from a jump-diffusion processes in space-time. We then calculate the one-dimensional laws of these two limit processes, and show that these laws solve forward and backward Kolmogorov equations with non-local time operators. Finally, we discuss an application of our theory to the case of subdiffusion in a time-dependent force-field. anomalous diffusion and functional limit theorem and fractional derivative and subordination and coupled random walks and fractional kinetics

1. Introduction

Continuous Time Random Walks (CTRWs) are generalizations of random walks which allow for the modelling of long resting periods, infinite variance jumps, and the coupling thereof. CTRWs are hence versatile models for anomalous diffusion processes and have found applications in a variety of fields such as physics [1], biology [2], finance [3] and hydrology [4]. There is a rich interplay between scaling limits of CTRWs and fractional differential equations: Waiting times whose tail probability has parameter $\alpha \in (0,1)$ usually lead to diffusion equations in which the time derivative has order α [5], and to the time-change by the inverse of a stable subordinator. For the theory on fractional differential equations of this kind see e.g. [6, 7, 8]. If the jumps have a regularly varying probability distribution with parameter $\beta \in (0,2)$, this yields fractional derivatives in space [9]. The functional limit theory for stochastic process limits of CTRWs has been developed in the series of papers [10, 11, 12, 13] for the cases of uncoupled and coupled waiting times, and governing differential equations were derived.

This paper aims at further generalizing the limit theory to coupled and uncoupled CTRWs for which the distribution of jumps and waiting times depends on space and time. Such processes are of interest in the physics literature [14, 15], and arise naturally e.g. in fractional chemotaxis problems [16]: Say particles of two species A and B are moving randomly according to subdiffusion, and A is attracted by B. This is modelled via a drift of A along the concentration gradient of species B, which changes in time and space. The "standard approach" of changing the clock process of A to an inverse stable subordinator then fails, even in the uncoupled case; this is particularly evident if the external time-dependence is non-random [17] and has in the past led to some confusion in the physics literature [18].

A theory for inhomogeneous jumps and waiting times has been developed in [19], with a focus on the position-dependence of jumps and waiting times. We extend the theory of functional limit theorems, limit laws and governing differential equations further, with a focus on time-dependence and a coupling between jumps and waiting times. In section 2, we prove a functional limit theorem for scaling limits of CTRWs. As discovered independently in [20] and [13], there are two different limit processes (CTRW limit and "overshooting" CTRW limit) if long waiting times occur simultaneously with long jumps. We also show how the limit processes can be represented as jump diffusions in space-time, yielding a convenient representation via a tuple of coefficients. In section 3 we calculate the laws of the two limit processes using the theory of entrance- and exit-distributions of Markov processes. In section 4 we derive backward differential equations for the two limit processes, and achieve in some sense generalized versions of Kolmogorov's backward equations. In section 5, we derive forward differential equations for the case where the coefficients of the jumps depend on both time and space. We close with an application of the developed theory to a subdiffusion process in a space- and time-varying potential.

2. Stochastic Process Limits of CTRWs

Continuous Time Random Walks (CTRWs) in state space $\mathbb{R}^d$ are given by

i) a sequence $J_1, J_2, \dots$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variables called the jumps and
ii) a sequence $W_1, W_2, \dots$ of $(0,\infty)$-valued random variables called the waiting times.

We consider scaling limits of CTRWs, and hence we introduce a scaling parameter $\tau > 0$, which we will attach to every random quantity. We then define the processes

$$A^\tau_t = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor} J^\tau_k, \qquad D^\tau_t = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor} W^\tau_k, \tag{2.1}$$

which have the interpretation that $A^\tau(n\tau)$ is the position of the walker after n steps, and $D^\tau(n\tau)$ is the sum of n waiting times. Now consider the process *inverse* to D^τ_t, which is defined as

$$E^\tau_t = \inf\{s > 0 : D^\tau(s) > t\} \tag{2.2}$$

and is also called the hitting time process. It takes values in $\tau\mathbb{N}$, and if $E^\tau_t = \tau k$ then the number of waiting times which have elapsed at or before time t is $k-1$. If one hence assumes that the k-th jump J^τ_k of the walker occurs at the *start* of the k-th waiting time W^τ_k, then this yields the process

$$Y^\tau_t = A^\tau(E^\tau_t), \tag{2.3}$$

and similarly if J^τ_k occurs at the *end* of the k-th waiting time then resulting process is

$$X^\tau_t = A^\tau(E^\tau_t - \tau). \tag{2.4}$$

In the literature, X^τ_t is commonly called a *Continuous Time Random Walk* (CTRW) and dates back to Montroll and Weiss [21]. The process Y^τ_t has been of interest in the recent literature [22, 13], and has been termed *overshooting CTRW* (OCTRW).

The scaling limit theory for X_t^τ and Y_t^τ has been studied for i.i.d. jumps and waiting times [13] and in the general case in [20]. We consider weak limits of probability measures on Skorohod path space $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, that is the set of all càdlàg paths in $\mathbb{R}^d$, endowed with Skorohod's $\mathbb{J}$-topology [23].

In the setup as above, the limit theorem reads as follows:

Theorem 2.1 ([20])**.** *Let D_t^τ be non-decreasing and unbounded for all $\tau > 0$, and assume that as $\tau \downarrow 0$ the $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$-valued process (A_t^τ, D_t^τ) converges weakly on $(\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}), \mathbb{J})$ to a limiting process (A_t, D_t), where D_t is unbounded and has strictly increasing sample paths a.s. Then the process E_t inverse to D_t has continuous sample paths a.s., and the processes X_t^τ and Y_t^τ converge weakly on $(\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d), \mathbb{J})$ to limiting processes X_t and Y_t given by*

$$X(t-) = A(E_t-) \qquad\qquad Y_t = A(E_t). \tag{2.5}$$

(Note: Both X_t and Y_t are càdlàg, and in general $A(E_t-) \neq A(E(t-)) = Y(t-)$.)

We will refer to X_t and Y_t by CTRWL and OCTRWL. The two limit processes X_t and Y_t are equal e.g. in the uncoupled case, where each waiting time is independent of each jump. In the coupled case, however, X_t and Y_t are different processes in general.

In this paper, we study CTRWs and OCTRWs which are renewed after every pair (J_k^τ, W_k^τ) of jumps and waiting times. To be precise, we assume that the discrete process

$$k \mapsto (A_{k\tau}^\tau, D_{k\tau}^\tau) \tag{2.6}$$

is a Markov chain in space-time $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ whose law is defined by a an initial distribution and a jump kernel $K^\tau(x, z; dy, dw)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[J_{n+1}^\tau \in dy, W_{n+1}^\tau \in dw | A_{n\tau}^\tau = x, D_{n\tau}^\tau = z] = K^\tau(x, z; dy, dw). \tag{2.7}$$

The paths of CTRWs and OCTRWs are uniquely determined by each realization of the above Markov chain, and we have the following interpretation: The CTRW X_t^τ is renewed after every jump, and the OCTRW Y_t^τ is renewed after every waiting time.
The space-time process (A_t, D_t). As τ decreases to 0, we assume that the jumps and waiting times become smaller, resulting in smaller and more frequent jumps. We introduce a class of potential limit processes (A_t, D_t) as follows: Let $b : \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \to \mathbb{R}^d$, $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and $a : \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ be bounded continuous functions, where $a(z, x)$ takes values in the non-negative definite matrices. We interpret these as coefficients named "spatial drift", "temporal drift" and "diffusivity." We also define a "space-time jump kernel" $K(x, z; dy, dw)$ as a kernel from $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ to $\{[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d\} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ which satisfies

$$\int K(x, t; dy, dw) \left((\|y\|^2 + |w|) \wedge 1 \right) < \infty, \qquad\qquad (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \tag{2.8}$$

where $\wedge$ denotes the minimum of two entities. We assume that $(x, t) \mapsto \int g(y, w) K(x, t; dy, dw)$ is continuous whenever $g(y, w)$ is a bounded continuous function which equals 0 in a neighborhood of the origin. Now let $\{T_s\}_{s\geq 0}$ be a Feller semigroup, acting on the Banach space $C_0(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ of real-valued functions defined on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ which are vanishing at

∞, and assume that T_s admits an infinitesimal generator of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}f(x,t) &= \sum_{i=1}^{d} b_i(x,t)\partial_i f(x,t) + \gamma(x,t)\partial_t f(x,t) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} a_{ij}(x,t)\partial_{ij} f(x,t) \\ &+ \iint \left[f(x+y,t+w) - f(x,t) - \sum_{i=1}^{d} h_i(y)\partial_i f(x,t)\right] K(x,t;dy,dw)\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where the vector $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is indexed by $1,\dots,d,d+1$ and where $h_i(y) = y_i \mathbf{1}\{\|y\| \leq 1\}$ is a truncation function. We then assume a stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_s, \mathbb{P}^{x,t})$ which satisfies the usual conditions (i.e. right-continuity of $\mathcal{F}_s$ and augmentation by $\mathbb{P}^{x,t}$-null sets) and an adapted process (A_s, D_s) on this basis whose finite-dimensional distributions are governed by T_s and the Chapman-Kolmogorov equations. In particular, the measure $\mathbb{P}^{x,t}$ only charges sample paths starting from (x,t) (that is, $\mathbb{P}^{x,t}((A_0,D_0) = (x,t)) = 1$), and we denote expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{x,t}$ by the operator $\mathbb{E}^{x,t}$. Processes satisfying such conditions exist, see e.g. [24, Ch.6].

The following proposition gives sufficient conditions for the convergence of (A_s^τ, D_s^τ) to (A_s, D_s):

Proposition 2.2. *Suppose the following convergence statements hold locally uniformly in (x,t):*

$$\lim_{\tau\downarrow 0} \tau^{-1} \int h_i(y) K^\tau(x,t;dy,dw) = b_i(x,t),\ 1 \leq i \leq d \tag{2.10}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\lim_{\tau\downarrow 0} \tau^{-1} \int\limits_{\{(y,w):0<w<\varepsilon\}} w K^\tau(x,t;dy,dw) = \gamma(x,t) \tag{2.11}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\lim_{\tau\downarrow 0} \tau^{-1} \int\limits_{\{(y,w):\|y\|\leq\varepsilon\}} y_i y_j K^\tau(x,t;dy,dw) = a_{ij}(x,t),\ 1 \leq i,j \leq d \tag{2.12}$$

$$\lim_{\tau\downarrow 0} \tau^{-1} \int g(y,w) K^\tau(x,t;dy,dw) = \int g(y,w) K(x,t;dy,dw), \tag{2.13}$$

for each real-valued bounded continuous function $g(y,w)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ which equals 0 in a neighborhood of the origin $(0,0)$. Assume moreover a family $\{\eta^\tau\}_{\tau>0}$ of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ such that $\lim_{\tau\downarrow 0}\eta^\tau = \eta$ holds in the weak sense. Then (A_t^τ, D_t^τ) with initial distribution η^τ converges weakly on $(\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}), \mathbb{J})$ to the process (A_t, D_t) with initial distribution η, as $\tau \downarrow 0$.

Proof. We apply [25, theorem IX.4.8]. First, we replace time t in (A_t^τ, D_t^τ) with the process $\tau N(t/\tau)$, where N_t is an independent standard Poisson process of intensity 1. Observe that this has no effect on X_t^τ and Y_t^τ: the trajectories of the CTRW and OCTRW only depend on the set of points traversed by (A_t^τ, D_t^τ) and not on the time at which these points are traversed. By slight abuse of notation, we again write (A_t^τ, D_t^τ) for the process resulting from this time-change. We have thus achieved that (A_t^τ, D_t^τ) is a pure jump Markov process in continuous time, with state space $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Its jumps arrive at the rate τ^{-1}. Relative to the truncation function

$$\bar{h}(x,w) = \begin{cases} (x,w) & \text{if } \|(x,w)\| < 1 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

the process (A^τ_t, D^τ_t) is hence a semimartingale with characteristics $((B^\tau, \Gamma^\tau), C^\tau, \nu^\tau)$ relative to $\bar{h}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
B^\tau_i(t) &= \int_0^t b^\tau_i(A^\tau_s, D^\tau_s)ds, & b^\tau_i(x,w) &= \tau^{-1}\int \bar{h}_i(y,v)\ K^\tau(x,w;dy,dv) \\
\Gamma^\tau(t) &= \int_0^t \gamma^\tau(A^\tau_s, D^\tau_s)ds, & \gamma^\tau(x,w) &= \tau^{-1}\int \bar{h}_{d+1}(y,v)\ K^\tau(x,w;dy,dv) \\
C^\tau_{ij}(t) &= \int_0^t c^\tau_{ij}(A^\tau_s, D^\tau_s)ds, & c^\tau_{ij}(x,w) &= \tau^{-1}\int \bar{h}_i\bar{h}_j(y,v)\ K^\tau(x,w;dy,dv) \\
\nu^\tau(ds;dy,dv) &= K^\tau(A^\tau_s, D^\tau_s;dy,dv)ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that (2.11) and (2.12) are equivalent to

$$\lim_{\tau\downarrow 0}\tau^{-1}\int_{\{(y,w):0<w<1\}} wK^\tau(x,z;dy,dw) = \gamma(x,z) + \int \bar{h}_{d+1}(y,v)K(x,w;dy,dv) \tag{2.14}$$

$$\lim_{\tau\downarrow 0}\tau^{-1}\int_{\{(y,w):\|y\|\leq 1\}} y_iy_jK^\tau(x,z;dy,dw) = a_{ij}(x,z) + \int \bar{h}_i\bar{h}_j(y,v)K(x,w;dy,dv), \tag{2.15}$$

$1 \leq i,j \leq d$, and that relative to $\bar{h}$, the $d+1$-component of the first characteristic of (A_t, D_t) is

$$\Gamma_t = \int_0^t \gamma(A_s, D_s)ds + \int \bar{h}_{d+1}(y,v)K(A_s,D_s;dy,dv), \tag{2.16}$$

and hence our requirements match with the those of the cited result. □

Together with theorem 2.1, the above proposition shows that a large class of stochastic process limits of CTRWs and OCTRWs of renewal type can be effectively expressed via a tuple of coefficients[1] (γ, a, b, K). Moreover, proposition 2.2 provides sufficient conditions on a sequence of (O)CTRWs to be an approximating sequence of an (O)CTRW limit process with given coefficients (γ, a, b, K).

3. LAWS OF CTRW LIMITS

In this section we calculate the laws of the CTRW limit X_t and the OCTRW limit Y_t for fixed t. The main idea is to formulate our setting as an entrance-exit problem for a Markov process: X_t is the last position of A before (A_s, D_s) exits from the set $\mathbb{R}^d \times (-\infty, t]$, and Y_t is first position of A when (A, D) enters the set $\mathbb{R}^d \times [t, \infty)$.

---

[1] We note however that this representation is subject to one degree of freedom: for $c > 0$, the tuple (γ, a, b, K) will yield the same CTRW and OCTRW limit as $(c\gamma, ca, cb, cK)$.

We introduce the 0-potential kernel U of (A, D), which arises from the semigroup (T_s) and acts on the non-negative measurable functions f defined on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ as follows:

$$Uf(x,t) := \int f(y,w)U(x,t;dy,dw) = \int_0^\infty T_s f(x,t)ds = \mathbb{E}^{x,t}\left[\int_0^\infty f(A(s),D(s))ds\right] \tag{3.1}$$

Note that Uf can be infinite, and hence we make the assumption

$$(x,t) \mapsto Uf(x,t) \text{ is bounded if } f \text{ is supported on } \mathbb{R}^d \times [a,b],\ -\infty < a \le b < \infty. \tag{3.2}$$

This assumption reflects the "transience" of D_s, and is satisfied e.g. if D_s is a subordinator [26]. Next, we introduce the random set $\mathbf{C}$ of points $t \in \mathbb{R}$ which are traversed continuously by D_s:

$$\mathbf{C} := \{(t,\omega) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega : t = D_r(\omega) = D_{r-}(\omega) \text{ for some } r \ge 0\}$$

We write $\{t \in \mathbf{C}\}$ or $\mathbf{C}_t$ for the event $\{\omega \in \Omega : (t,\omega) \in \mathbf{C}\}$, and we calculate the law of X_t and Y_t separately on the two sets $\{t \notin \mathbf{C}\}$ and $\{t \in \mathbf{C}\}$.

Proposition 3.1. *Fix $(x,s) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and let $t > s$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}^{x,s}\left[f(X_{t-},Y_t); \{t \notin \mathbf{C}\}\right] = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^d \times [s,t]} U(x,s;dy,dv) \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^d \times [t-v,\infty)} f(y,y+z)K(y,v;dz,dw)$$

for all bounded measurable f defined on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. The complement of $\mathbf{C}(\omega)$ in $\mathbb{R}$ is a.s. a countable union of closed intervals $[D_{u-}, D_u]$, where u is a jump instant of the process D. We have $D_{E_t-} \le t \le D_{E_t}$ for all $t \ge s$. One also checks that $\Delta D_{E_t} > 0$ on the set $\{t \notin \mathbf{C}\}$. On the set $\{t \in \mathbf{C}\}$, one has $\Delta D_{E_t} = 0$: To see this, first note that $\{E_t \le u\} = \{D_u \ge t\}$ a.s. and hence E_t is an $\mathcal{F}_t$-stopping time. On the set $\{t \in \mathbf{C}\}$, the sample path of E_t is (left-)increasing at t, and hence the $\mathcal{F}$-optional time E_t is announced by the optional times $E_{t-1/n}$. E_t is hence $\mathcal{F}$-predictable [27, p.410]. Without loss of generality we choose the canonical setting $\Omega = \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ with natural filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$. Then (A_t, D_t) is quasi left-continuous [27, prop.22.20], and $\Delta(A,D)_{E_t} = 0$ a.s.

Thus writing $\mathcal{J} = \{(r,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega : \Delta(A,D)_r \ne (0,0)\}$ for the optional set of jump times, we find

$$\begin{aligned} f(X_{t-},Y_t)\mathbf{1}\{t \notin \mathbf{C}\} &= \sum_{r \in \mathcal{J}} f(A_{r-},A_r)\mathbf{1}\{D_{r-} \le t \le D_r\} \\ &= \sum_{r \in \mathcal{J}} f(A_{r-},A_{r-}+\Delta A_r)\mathbf{1}\{D_{r-} \le t \le D_{r-}+\Delta D_r\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

The last expression equals $\int W(\omega,r;y,w)\mu(\omega,dr;dy,dw)$ for the optional random measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ associated with the jumps of the process (A,D),

$$\mu(\omega,dr;dy,dw) = \sum_{v \ge 0} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{J}}(v,\omega)\delta_{(v;\Delta(A,D)_v(\omega))}(dr;dy,dw), \tag{3.4}$$

and the predictable integrand

$$\begin{aligned}&W(\omega, r; y, w)\\&:= f(A_{r-}(\omega), A_{r-}(\omega)+y)\mathbf{1}\{D_{r-}(\omega) \le t \le D_{r-}(\omega)+w\}.\end{aligned}$$

The compensator μ^p of μ equals

$$\mu^p(\omega; dr, dy, dw) = K(A_{r-}(\omega), D_{r-}(\omega); dy, dw)dr. \tag{3.5}$$

According to the compensation formula [25, II.1.8], taking expectations on both sides of (3.3) then yields the proposition. □

Proposition 3.2. *Fix* $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. *Suppose that the measure* $U(x, s; \cdot)$ *is Lebesgue-absolutely continuous with density* $(y, w) \mapsto u(x, s; y, w)$. *Then for Lebesgue-almost every* $t > s$ *and every bounded continuous* f,

$$\mathbb{E}^{x,s}\left[f(Y_t)\mathbf{1}\{t \in \mathbf{C}\}\right] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y)\gamma(y, t)u(s, x; y, t)\, dx. \tag{3.6}$$

Moreover, the above holds true if Y_t *is replaced by* X_{t-}, X_t *or* Y_{t-}.

Proof. Similarly as in [28], D_r admits a decomposition into a continuous and a discontinuous part via

$$D_r^c = \int_0^r \gamma(A_v, D_v)dv, \qquad D_r^d = \sum_{0 \le v \le r} \Delta D_v, \qquad r \ge 0.$$

To see this, we first note that (A_r, D_r) is a semimartingale, and hence D_r allows the decomposition

$$D_r = \sum_{v \le r} \Delta D_v \mathbf{1}\{\Delta D_v > 1\} + B_r + M_r \tag{3.7}$$

where B_r is a predictable process of finite variation (the first characteristic of D_r) and M_r is a local martingale. Due to [25, IX §4a] and (2.9), $B_r = \int_0^r \tilde{\gamma}(A_v, D_v)dv$ where $\tilde{\gamma}(y, w) = \gamma(y, w) + \int v\mathbf{1}\{\|(z, v)\| \le 1\}K(y, w; dz, dv)$. Since D_r has no diffusive part, M_r is purely discontinuous and equal to

$$M_r = \sum_{v \le r} \Delta D_v \mathbf{1}\{\Delta D_v \le 1\} - \iint w\mathbf{1}\{\|(y, w)\| \le 1\}K(A_v, D_v; dy, dw)ds.$$

But then (3.7) reads $D_r = D_r^d + D_r^c$.

For fixed ω, the paths of $D_\cdot$, $D_\cdot^c$ and $D_\cdot^d$ are non-decreasing and hence define Lebesgue-Stieltjes measures dD, dD^c and dD^d on $[0, \infty)$. Then for any bounded continuous f and g we have

$$\int_0^\infty f(A_v)g(D_v)\gamma(A_v, D_v)dv = \int_0^\infty f(A_v)g(D_v)dD_v^c. \tag{3.8}$$

The continuous measure dD^c does not charge the countable set $\{v : \Delta D_v \neq 0\}$ of discontinuities of $D_\cdot$ and coincides with dD on the complement $\{v : \Delta D_v = 0\}$. Hence the last integral can be written as

$$\int_0^\infty f(A_v)g(D_v)\mathbf{1}\{v : \Delta D_v = 0\}dD_v.$$

Using the substitution formula

$$\int_0^\infty f(r)dD_r = \int_0^\infty f(E_r)dr,$$

valid for all strictly increasing (not necessarily continuous) D and continuous f, we get

$$\int_0^\infty f(Y_t)g(D_{E_t})\mathbf{1}\{t : \Delta D_{E_t} = 0\}dt.$$

Now note that $\Delta D_{E_t} = 0$ is equivalent to $t \in \mathbf{C}$ and implies $D_{E_t} = t$. Hence the above lines show that the left hand side of (3.8) equals

$$\int_0^\infty f(A_v)g(D_v)\gamma(A_v, D_v)dv = \int_0^\infty f(Y_t)g(t)\mathbf{1}\{t \in \mathbf{C}\}dt.$$

Applying expectations and Tonelli's theorem yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} f(y)g(t)\gamma(y,t)u(x,s;y,t)\,dy\,dt = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}^{x,s}[f(Y_t)\mathbf{1}\{t \in \mathbf{C}\}]g(t)dt.$$

Since g is an arbitrary bounded continuous function, this yields (3.6) for almost every t. For any fixed t, we have already noted in the proof of the preceding proposition that $\Delta(A,D)_{E_t} = (0,0)$, $\mathbb{P}^{x,s}$-almost surely on $\{t \in \mathbf{C}\}$. This and the continuity of sample paths of E_t shows $X_t - X_{t-} = 0 = Y_t - Y_{t-}$ on $\{t \in \mathbf{C}\}$. □

We can now characterize the joint law of X_t and Y_t at a fixed time t:

Theorem 3.3. *Fix a starting point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a starting time $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose the 0-potential $U(x,s;\cdot)$ has a Lebesgue density $(y,v) \mapsto u(x,s;y,v)$ which is continuous on the set $\mathbb{R}^d \times (s,\infty)$. Then for every $t > s$ and every bounded continuous f defined on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$,*

(3.9)
$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{x,s}\left[f(X_t,Y_t)\right] &= \int_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(y,y)\gamma(y,t)u(x,s;y,t)dy \\ &\quad + \int_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{v=s}^t u(x,s;y,v)\int_{z\in\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{w>t-v} f(y,y+z)K(y,v;dz,dw)\,dy\,dv.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, Y_t has no fixed discontinuities, and if $K(y,v;\mathbb{R}^d \times \{w\}) = 0$ for all y, v, w, then X_t has no fixed discontinuities.

Proof. Equation (3.9) holds for almost all $t \geq s$, which follows from the addition of Propositions 3.1 and 3.2; note that the domain $w \geq t - v$ may be replaced by $w > t - v$ since $K(y,v;\mathbb{R}^d \times \{w\}) > 0$ for only countably many $w > 0$. Consider now a sequence $t_n \to t$ such that $t_n > t$ and (3.9) holds for t_n. Then pointwise in Lebesgue-almost every y (resp. (y,v)), the integrands converge. Equation (3.9) hence follows for *all* $t \geq s$, by right-continuity and the dominated convergence theorem.

For the remaining statements, let

$$\mathbf{G} := \{(t,\omega) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega : D_r^-(\omega) = t < D_r(\omega) \text{ for some } r \geq 0\}$$

denote the random set of left endpoints of the intervals contiguous to the range $\{D_r : r \geq 0\}$ of D, and let

$$\mathbf{D} := \{(t,\omega) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega : D_r^-(\omega) < t = D_r(\omega) \text{ for some } r \geq 0\}$$

denote the random set of right endpoints. Recall that the process E has continuous non-decreasing sample paths a.s., since D is strictly increasing a.s. These sample paths are right-increasing and left-constant at t whenever $t \in \mathbf{D}$, and they are left-increasing and right-constant at t whenever $t \in \mathbf{G}$. If $t \geq s$ is a discontiuity of the process X, i.e. $\{t \in disc(X)\}$, we find $A^-(E(t)) \neq A^-(E(t+))$, which is equivalent to $E(t) \in disc(A)$ and $E(t)$ being right-increasing at t. We have seen in the proof of Proposition 3.1 that $E(t) \notin disc(A)$ a.s. on the set $\{t \in \mathbf{C}\}$. Hence $disc(X) \subseteq \mathbf{D}$ a.s. Similarly, one sees that $disc(Y) \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ a.s. Now an application of the compensation formula yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}^{x,s}(t \in \mathbf{D}) &= \mathbb{E}^{x,s}\left[\sum_{r\geq 0} \mathbf{1}\{D_r^- < t\}\mathbf{1}\{\Delta D_r = t - D_r^-\}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{x,s}\left[\int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}\{D_r^- < t\} K\left(A_r^-, D_r^-; \mathbb{R}^d \times \{t - D_r^-\}\right) dr\right],\end{aligned}$$

which vanishes under the conditions of Statement 2, and similarly we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}^{x,s}(\exists r > 0 : D_r^- = t < D_r - \varepsilon) &= \mathbb{E}^{x,s}\left[\sum_{r\geq 0} \mathbf{1}\{D_r^- = t\}\mathbf{1}\{\Delta D_r > \varepsilon\}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{x,s}\left[\int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}\{D_r^- = t\} K\left(A_r^-, D_r^-; \mathbb{R}^d \times (\varepsilon, \infty)\right) dr\right] = 0\end{aligned}$$

since D is a.s. strictly increasing. But since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, this means $\mathbb{P}^{x,s}(t \in \mathbf{G}) = 0$. □

We now define the transition kernels corresponding to the processes X and Y as

$$P_{s,t}f(x) := \mathbb{E}^{x,s}[f(X_t)], \qquad Q_{s,t}f(x) := \mathbb{E}^{x,s}[f(Y_t)]. \tag{3.10}$$

We can give simplified formulas for probability densities of X_t and Y_t:

Corollary 3.4. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 3.3. Then the kernel $P_{s,t}(x, dy)$ has a density $P_{s,t}(x, y)$ whenever $t > s$, given by*

$$P_{s,t}(x, y) = \gamma(y, t)u(x, s; y, t) + \int_{v=s}^t u(x, s; y, v)K(y, v; \mathbb{R}^d \times (t - v, \infty))\, dv. \tag{3.11}$$

For the kernel $Q_{s,t}(x, dy)$, we find

$$Q_{s,t}(x, dy) = \gamma(y, t)u(x, s; y, t)dy + \int_{z\in\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{v=s}^t u(x, s; z, v)K(z, v; (dy - z) \times (t - v, \infty))\, dz\, dv. \tag{3.12}$$

The above formulas extend results which were given in [12, 13] for the case of constant coefficients and $\gamma = 0$.

4. BACKWARD DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

In this section we derive backward differential equations for the transition probabilities $P_{s,t}(x,y)$ and $Q_{s,t}(x,dy)$ of CTRW and OCTRW limit processes. We interpret (x,s) as the backward and (y,t) as the forward variables.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose the* 0*-potential kernel* $U(x,s;\cdot,\cdot)$ *of the space-time process* (A_r, D_r) *admits a Lebesgue density* $(y,t) \mapsto u(x,s;y,t)$ *for every* $(x,s) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$*, which is such that the map* $(x,s) \mapsto u(x,s;y,t)$ *has bounded partial derivatives up to second order outside every neighborhood of* (y,t)*. Moreover, assume that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{x,s} \iint u(x,s;y,t) F_1(y,t)\, dy\, dt = \iint \mathcal{L}_{x,s} u(x,s;y,t) F_1(y,t)\, dy\, dt, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{x,s} \int u(x,s;y,t) F_2(y)\, dy = \int \mathcal{L}_{x,s} u(x,s;y,t) F_2(y)\, dy \tag{4.2}$$

for all locally integrable functions F_1 *and* F_2 *for which the integrals are defined. Then for fixed* $t \in \mathbb{R}$*,*

$$-\mathcal{L}_{x,s} P_{s,t} f(x) = f(x) K(x,s;\mathbb{R}^d \times (t-s,\infty)), \qquad s < t, \quad P_{t,t} f(x) = f(x), \tag{4.3}$$

$$-\mathcal{L}_{x,s} Q_{s,t} f(x) = \int f(x+z) K(x,s;dz \times (t-s,\infty)), \quad s < t, \quad Q_{t,t} f(x) = f(x), \tag{4.4}$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *and* $f \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$*.*

Proof. We will apply the operator $\mathcal{L}_{x,s}$ to $P_{s,t} f(x) = \int f(y) P_{s,t}(x,y) dy$. Our first step is to note that

$$\mathcal{L}_{x,s} u(x,s;y,t) = 0 \tag{4.5}$$

for Lebesgue almost all $(y,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and all $(x,s) \neq (y,t)$. To see this, let $\phi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ have compact support. Then $U\phi$ defines a bounded function due to assumption (3.2). For $\lambda > 0$, the λ-potential of the semigroup T_r is defined as the kernel $f \mapsto U^\lambda f = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda r} T_\tau f dr$. It is known [29] that U^λ maps $C_0(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ into the domain of $\mathcal{L}$, and that $(\lambda - \mathcal{L}) U^\lambda \phi = \phi$. But then

$$\mathcal{L} U\phi = \mathcal{L} \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} U^\lambda \phi = \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \mathcal{L} U^\lambda \phi = \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \lambda U^\lambda \phi - \phi = -\phi,$$

using the fact that $\mathcal{L}$ is a closed operator. If the support of ϕ does not contain (x,s), then

$$\iint \mathcal{L}_{x,s} u(x,s;y,t) \phi(y,t)\, dy\, dt = \mathcal{L}_{x,s} \iint u(x,s;y,t) \phi(y,t)\, dy\, dt = \mathcal{L} U\phi(x,s) = -\phi(x,s) = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Our next step is to write

$$P_{s,t} f(x) = I_1(x,s) + I_2(x,s) + I_3(x,s),$$
$$Q_{s,t} f(x) = I_1(x,s) + I_4(x,s) + I_5(x,s),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1(x,s) &= \int_y f(y)\gamma(y,t)u(x,s;y,t)\,dy\\
I_2(x,s) &= \int_y f(y)\int_v u(x,s;y,v)K(y,v;\mathbb{R}^d\times(t-v,\infty))g(v)\,dv\,dy\\
I_3(x,s) &= \int_y f(y)\int_{v<t} u(x,s;y,v)K(y,v;\mathbb{R}^d\times(t-v,\infty))(1-g(v))\,dv\,dy\\
I_4(x,s) &= \int_y\int_v g(v)u(x,s;y,v)\int_z\int_{w>t-v} f(y+z)K(y,v;dz\times dw)\,dy\,dv\\
I_5(x,s) &= \int_y\int_{v<t}(1-g(v))u(x,s;y,v)\int_z\int_{w>t-v} f(y+z)K(y,v;dz\times dw)\,dy\,dv
\end{aligned}$$

and where g is a non-increasing continuous function defined on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $g^{-1}(\{1\}) = (-\infty, s+\varepsilon]$ and $g^{-1}(\{0\}) = [t-\varepsilon,\infty)$, and where $s < s+\varepsilon < t-\varepsilon < t$. Note that $u(x,s;y,t)$ is not supported on $\{s \geq t\}$, hence we can omit the integration boundary $v > s$. By our assumption on $u(x,s;y,t)$, we find $\mathcal{L}I_1(x,s) = \mathcal{L}I_3(x,s) = \mathcal{L}I_5(x,s) = 0$. We can express

$$I_2(x,s) = UF_P(x,s), \qquad I_4(x,s) = UF_Q(x,s) \tag{4.7}$$

where $F_P(y,v) = f(y)g(v)K(y,v;\mathbb{R}^d\times(t-v,\infty))$ and $F_Q(y,v) = g(v)\int_z\int_{w>t-v} f(y+z)K(y,v;dz\times dw)$ define functions in $C_0(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Hence we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}I_2(x,s) &= \mathcal{L}UF_P(x,s) = -F_P(x,s) = -f(x)K(x,s;\mathbb{R}^d\times(t-s,\infty)),\\
\mathcal{L}I_4(x,s) &= \mathcal{L}UF_Q(x,s) = -F_Q(x,s) = -\int f(x+z)K(x,s;dz\times(t-s,\infty)).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows the first statements in (4.3) & (4.4), and $P_{t,t}f(x) = f(x)$ and $Q_{t,t}f(x) = f(x)$ follow from the right-continuity of the sample paths of (A_r, D_r) and from D_r having strictly increasing sample paths.

□

Remark 4.2. The assumption that the potential measure of the space-time process (A_r, D_r) has a twice continuously differentiable density with bounded derivatives seems to be a bearable restriction, but it is surprisingly hard to check. In [30], conditions are given under which the transition probability of (A_r, D_r) has a joint density $p_r(x,s;y,t)$ of class C^2; however, in order to transfer this property to the *potential* density $u(x,s;y,t)$ via a dominated convergence argument, one needs the uniform boundedness of these derivatives, and boundedness is not shown in this book.

5. FORWARD DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

In this section we derive governing differential equations in the forward variables (y,t) for the (O)CTRW limit densities $P_{s,t}(x,y)$ and $Q_{s,t}(x,dy)$. We rely on two simplifying assumptions:

(1) The law of the waiting times only depends on the current position in space x, and not the current time t. That is, we can write $K(y, v; dz \times dw) = K(y; dz \times dw)$, and $\gamma(y, v) = \gamma(y)$.
(2) Jumps and waiting times are uncoupled. That is, the measures $dz \times dw \mapsto K(x; dz \times dw)$ are supported only on the "coordinate axes" $(\mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}) \cup (\{0\} \times (0, \infty))$. This means that CTRW and OCTRW are indistinguishable, and $P_{s,t}(x, y)dy = Q_{s,t}(x, dy)$.

The generator $\mathcal{L}$ in (2.9) then decomposes as $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{D}$. The operator $\mathcal{A}$ acts only on the space variable, but its coefficients may depend on time t, which we highlight by the notation $\mathcal{A}(t)$. Similarly, $\mathcal{D}$ acts only on the time variable, but its coefficients may depend on space, and we write $\mathcal{D}(x)$. If it is unclear which variable an operator is acting on (i.e. y or z), we will put this variable in lower script, e.g. $\mathcal{A}_y(t)$. The operators $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, explicitly, are

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}(t)f(x) = &\sum_{i=1}^d b_i(x,t)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}f(x) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}(x,t)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}f(x) \\ &+ \int_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d}\left[f(x+y) - f(x) - \sum_{i=1}^d h_i(y)\partial_i f(x)\right]K(x,t;dy \times \{0\}),\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

$$\mathcal{D}(x)g(t) = \gamma(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial t}g(t) + \int_{w>0}[g(t+w) - g(t)]K(x;\{0\}\times dw). \tag{5.2}$$

Hence if $f \in dom(\mathcal{A}(t))$ for all t and $g \in dom(\mathcal{D}(x))$ for all x, then the function $f \otimes g(x,t) := f(x)g(t)$ lies in $dom(\mathcal{L})$ and

$$\mathcal{L}[f \otimes g](x,t) = (\mathcal{A}(t)f(x))g(t) + (\mathcal{D}(x)g(t))f(x). \tag{5.3}$$

Finally, we introduce a *memory kernel* $\mathcal{M}$ as follows: For every $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, write $dt \mapsto I(y, dt)$ for the measure on $(0, \infty)$ whose Laplace transform is

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}I(y,dt) = \lambda\gamma(y) + \lambda h(y,\lambda), \quad h(y,\lambda) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}K(y;\mathbb{R}^d \times (t,\infty))\,dt. \tag{5.4}$$

Such a measure exists; it is the 0-potential of the subordinator with drift $\gamma(y)$ and Lévy measure with tail function $t \mapsto K(y; \mathbb{R}^d \times (t, \infty))$, see e.g. [26]. The operator $\mathcal{M}$ then acts on the transition probability $P_{s,t}(x, y)$ via

$$[\mathcal{M}P]_{s,t}(x,y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\int P_{s,t-r}(x,y)I(y,dr). \tag{5.5}$$

Note that we extend $P_{s,t}(x, y)$ by the value 0 whenever $t < s$, and hence the integral may be taken over the entire domain $r \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume the conditions from Theorem 3.3 and the beginning of this section. Then the transition densities $P_{s,t}(x, y)$ satisfy the forward equation*

$$P_{s,s}f(x) = f(x), \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial t}P_{s,t}f(x) = [\mathcal{M}P]_{s,t}\mathcal{A}(t)f(x), \qquad t > s, \tag{5.6}$$

whenever $f \in \bigcap_{t\in\mathbb{R}} dom(\mathcal{A}(t)) \subset C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *and* $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *are such that* $t \mapsto P_{s,t}f(x)$ *has a continuous derivative for* $t > s$ *and* $(x,t) \mapsto \mathcal{A}(t)f(x)$ *is uniformly continuous on* $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

Proof. Let $g \in dom(\mathcal{D}(x))$ for all x, and let g have compact support contained in (s,∞). Then $f \otimes g \in dom(\mathcal{L})$, and

$$f \otimes g = U^\lambda(\lambda - \mathcal{L})(f\otimes g) = \lambda U^\lambda(f\otimes g) - U^\lambda \mathcal{L}(f\otimes g),$$

where $\lambda > 0$ and U^λ denotes the resolvent operator associated with $\mathcal{L}$ [31]. Letting $\lambda \downarrow 0$ together with (3.2) then shows that $-U\mathcal{L}(f\otimes g)$ exists and equals $f\otimes g$. We then find

$$-f\otimes g = U\mathcal{L}(f\otimes g) = U[(\mathcal{A}f)g + (\mathcal{D}g)f],$$

$$-f(x)g(s) = \langle u(x,s;y,\tau), \mathcal{A}_y(\tau)f(y)g(\tau)\rangle_{y,\tau} + \langle u(x,s;y,\tau), \mathcal{D}_\tau(y)g(\tau)f(y)\rangle_{y,\tau}, \tag{5.7}$$

where we have used the notation $\langle f,g\rangle_{y,\tau} = \iint f(y,\tau)g(y,\tau)\,dy\,d\tau$. For the first term on the right-hand side of (5.7), we use the formula

$$[\mathcal{M}P]_{s,\tau}(x,y) = u(x,s;y,\tau). \tag{5.8}$$

To see that it holds, we first find the Laplace transform of $P_{0,\tau}(x,y)$,

$$\int_0^\infty P_{0,\tau}(x,y)e^{-\lambda\tau}\,d\tau = [\gamma(y) + h(y,\lambda)]\int_0^\infty u(x,0;y,\tau)e^{-\lambda\tau}\,d\tau,$$

which shows

$$\int_0^\infty P_{0,\tau-r}(x,y)I(y,dr) = \int_0^\tau u(x,0;y,r)dr,$$

after an application of the convolution formula for Laplace transforms. A similar calculation with 0 replaced by s then shows (5.8). For the second term on the right-hand side of (5.7), we consider a test function $\phi \in C_c^\infty((s,\infty))$, and calculate

(5.9)

$$\begin{aligned}\langle u(x,s;y,\tau), \mathcal{D}\phi(\tau)\rangle_\tau &= \left\langle u(x,s;y,\tau), \gamma(y)\phi'(\tau) + \int_0^\infty [\phi(\tau+w) - \phi(\tau)]K(y;\mathbb{R}^d\times dw)\right\rangle_\tau \\ &= \left\langle u(x,s;y,\tau), \gamma(y)\phi'(\tau) + \int_0^\infty \phi'(\tau+w)K(y;\mathbb{R}^d\times(w,\infty))\right\rangle_\tau \\ &= \langle u(x,s;y,\tau)\gamma(y), \phi'(\tau)\rangle_\tau + \left\langle \int_0^\infty u(x,s;y,\tau-w)K(y;\mathbb{R}^d\times(w,\infty)), \phi'(\tau)\right\rangle \\ &= \langle P_{s,\tau}(x,y), \phi'(\tau)\rangle_\tau = -\left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}P_{s,\tau}(x,y), \phi(\tau)\right\rangle_\tau.\end{aligned}$$

Now we replace g in (5.7) by a sequence of functions which approximate the Dirac distribution concentrated at $t > s$. Using (5.8) and (5.9), we arrive at

$$0 = \langle [\mathcal{M}P]_{s,t}(x,y), \mathcal{A}_y(t)f(y)\rangle_y - \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial t}P_{s,t}(x,y), f(y)\right\rangle_y. \tag{5.10}$$

in the limit. This shows the sought differential equation, and $P_{s,s}f(x) = f(x)$ follows from the right-continuity of sample paths of (A_r, D_r) and D_r being strictly increasing a.s. □

The above theorem extends the main result in [14], which was the derivation of a Fokker-Planck equation in the case where D_r is a stable subordinator and A_r a process with continuous sample paths. It applies to space-dependent waiting times and a limit process A_r which may have discontinuous sample paths.

In the case where D_r has i.i.d. increments (i.e. a Lévy process started at s) and the jumps are homogeneous in time (i.e. $\mathcal{A}(t)$ does not depend on t), we have a simplified result (compare [19, Eq.(35)]). Define the formal adjoint of $\mathcal{D}(x)$ as the operator

$$\mathcal{D}^\star(x)g(t) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\gamma(x)g(t) + \int_{w>0}[g(t-w) - g(t)]K(x;\{0\}\times dw). \tag{5.11}$$

It satisfies

$$\langle \mathcal{D}_t(x)h(x,t), \phi(x,t)\rangle_{x,t} = \langle h(x,t), \mathcal{D}_t^*(x)\phi(x,t)\rangle_{x,t} \tag{5.12}$$

for every test function $\phi \in C_c^\infty$.

Corollary 5.2. *Assume the same conditions as in the above theorem, and additionally suppose that A_r is homogeneous in time and D_r is homogeneous in both time and space; that is, $\gamma(x,t) = \gamma \equiv const$, $K(x,t;\{0\}\times(w,\infty)) = h(w)$ and $\mathcal{A}(t) = \mathcal{A}$ for some operator $\mathcal{A}$ and all t. Then the transition densities $P_{s,t}(x,y)$ of the CTRW limit satisfy*

$$P_{s,s}f(x) = f(x), \qquad -\mathcal{D}_t^* P_{s,t}f(x) = P_{s,t}\mathcal{A}f(x) + f(x)h(t-s), \qquad t > s \tag{5.13}$$

for each $f \in dom(\mathcal{A})$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $t \mapsto P_{s,t}f(x)$ is differentiable on (s,∞).

Proof. Without loss of generality let $s = 0$. Integrating (5.6) with respect to t yields

$$P_{0,t}f(x) - f(x) = \int P_{0,t-r}\mathcal{A}f(x)I(dr). \tag{5.14}$$

Now let $g(t)$ be an integrable function which is continuous on $[0,\infty)$ and which vanishes at 0. If its Laplace transform equals $\lambda \mapsto \tilde{g}(\lambda)$, then the Laplace transform of $-\mathcal{D}^*g(t)$ equals $\lambda(\gamma + \tilde{h}(\lambda))\tilde{g}(\lambda)$. Applying this, the definition (5.4) of $I(dr)$ and uniqueness of Laplace transforms to the above equation yields the corollary. □

A similar result has been given for fractional dynamics, corresponding to a stable subordinator D_r, see [8].

6. Examples

6.1. **Subdiffusion in a space- and time-dependent force field.** We consider a CTRW limit process that results from i.i.d. waiting times with Pareto distribution of tail parameter $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Let $\psi(w) = \alpha(1+w)^{-1-\alpha}$, and introduce the scaling parameter $\lambda > 0$. The rescaled density $\psi_\lambda(w) := \psi(w/\lambda)/\lambda$ satisfies

$$\lambda^{-\alpha}\psi_\lambda(t) \to \psi_0(t) := \alpha t^{-1-\alpha}. \tag{6.1}$$

As in [14], we consider nearest-neighbor jumps on a lattice with spacing $\Delta x > 0$. With probabilities $r(t,x)$ and $\ell(t,x)$, the particle at x jumps right or left at time t. These probabilities are given by a space- and time dependent potential $V(x,t)$ via

$$\begin{aligned} r(x,t) &= C^{-1}\exp\{-\beta[V(x+\Delta x,t)-V(x,t)]\},\\ \ell(x,t) &= C^{-1}\exp\{-\beta[V(x-\Delta x,t)-V(x,t)]\} \end{aligned}$$

where C is defined by $\ell(x,t)+r(x,t)=1$. If after k waiting times and jumps $(J_1,W_1),\dots,(J_k,W_k)$ the particle is at (x,t) in space-time, then the distribution of the $k+1$-st waiting time and jump pair (J_{k+1},W_{k+1}) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}((W_{k+1},J_{k+1})\in dw\times dy) = K^\tau(x,t;y,w)\,dy\,dw,\\ &\qquad K^\tau(x,t;y,w) = \psi_\lambda(w)[\ell(x,t+w)\delta(y+\Delta x)+r(x,t+w)\delta(y-\Delta x)] \end{aligned}$$

since the $k+1$st jump occurs at time $t+W_{k+1}$. The above can be simplified by noting that a process with the same distribution results if the $k+1$-st jump is assumed to occur at time t and the starting time s is replaced by $s+W_0$, where W_0 has the same distribution as all W_i. Now the kernel K^τ reads

$$K^\tau(x,t;y,w) = \psi_\lambda(w)[\ell(x,t)\delta(y+\Delta x)+r(x,t)\delta(y-\Delta x)].$$

We choose the following dependence of the temporal scale λ and the spatial scale Δx on τ:

$$\lambda^\alpha \sim \frac{\tau}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \qquad\qquad \Delta x^2 \sim \sigma^2\tau \tag{6.2}$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ denotes the Gamma function and σ^2 is the diffusion constant and where $f\sim g$ means that the quotient of f and g tends to 1.

We now check equations (2.10) to (2.13) to find that proposition 2.2 is fulfilled, with

$$\gamma=0,\quad b(x,t)=-\beta\sigma^2\partial_x V(x,t),\quad a(x,t)=\sigma^2,\quad K(x,t;y,w)=\delta(y)w^{-1-\alpha}/\Gamma(-\alpha).$$

Since now $K(x,t;\cdot,\cdot)$ is supported by the coordinate axes, the corresponding CTRW limit and OCTRW limit are the same. The backward equation for the density $(x,s)\mapsto P_{s,t}f(x)$ then reads

(6.3)
$$\left[\frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial(-s)^\alpha}-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}-\beta\sigma^2\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x}V(t,x)\right]\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right]P_{s,t}f(x) = f(x)\frac{(t-s)^{-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)},\quad P_{t,t}f(x)=f(x),$$

where $\partial^\alpha/\partial(-s)$ denotes the Riemann-Liouville negative fractional derivative of order α [19]. For the forward equation, we first note that D is a subordinator with symbol $\Psi(\lambda)=\lambda^\alpha$ [26] and the Laplace transform of $I(y,dt)=I(dt)$ is $\lambda^{-\alpha}$. Inversion yields $I(dt)=t^{\alpha-1}\,dt/\Gamma(1-\alpha)$. Hence convolution with the measure I is equivalent to a fractional integral of order α, and the memory kernel acts as a Riemann-Liouville fractional derivative of order $1-\alpha$. The forward equation for $P_{s,t}(x,y)$ hence reads

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}P_{s,t}f(x) = \left[\frac{\partial^{1-\alpha}}{\partial t^{1-\alpha}}P_{s,t}\right]\left[\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}+\beta\sigma^2\frac{\partial}{\partial x}V(x,t)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right]f(x),\quad P_{s,s}f(x)=f(x). \tag{6.4}$$

6.2. **Space-dependent Lévy walks.** Lévy walks were introduced in [32], and have only recently been studied on the stochastic process level [33]. Their main feature is that via a strong coupling between waiting time and jump, a finite travel "velocity" of the random walker is achieved at each step. Note however that each jump is instantaneous, and the term velocity is only to be interpreted in an averaged sense. The theory developed in this paper allows for a stochastic framework in which the velocity of the walker may vary in space.

We introduce the space-dependent travel speed $c(x) > 0$, which we assume smooth and bounded away from both 0 and ∞. We specify the CTRW limit process via its parameters

$$a = 0, \qquad b = 0, \qquad \gamma = 0, \qquad K(x; dz \times dw) = \frac{1}{c(x)} N\left(\frac{dz}{c(x)} \times dw\right) \tag{6.5}$$

where $N(dz \times dw)$ is the Lévy measure

$$N(dz \times dw) = \int_{S^{d-1}} \delta_{w\theta}(dz) \mathbf{1}\{w > 0\} \frac{dw}{w^{1+\alpha}} \lambda(d\theta) \tag{6.6}$$

on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Here δ_y denotes the Dirac measure concentrated at $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and λ is a spectral measure on the unit sphere S^{d-1} in $\mathbb{R}^d$. A Lévy process in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ with characteristics $(0, 0, N)$ is tightly coupled, in the sense that each jump in the $\mathbb{R}^d$-component is accompanied by a jump in the $\mathbb{R}$-component which has the same Euclidean length. In transitioning from $N(dz \times dw)$ to $K(x; dz \times dw)$ the waiting times are left unchanged, while the length of the spatial jumps is adjusted by the factor $c(x)$.

A sequence of CTRWs which converges to the limit process as defined above is achieved through letting $\tau \downarrow 0$, where for each τ we consider a CTRW corresponding (for instance) to the space-time kernel

$$K^\tau(x; dz \times dw) = \int_{S^{d-1}} \delta_{wc(x)\theta}(dz) \mathbf{1}\{w > 0\} \frac{\alpha\, dw}{c(x)\tau^{1/\alpha}(1 + w\tau^{-1/\alpha})^{1+\alpha}} \lambda(d\theta). \tag{6.7}$$

6.3. **Waiting times with space-dependent heavy tail parameter.** In [34], CTRWs with varying "anomalous exponent" were studied. We assume that the heavy tail parameter $\alpha(x)$ is a smooth function of space, which takes values in the interval $(0, 1)$ and is bounded away from both 0 and 1. Jumps are of nearest neighbor type and symmetric, on a lattice with spacing τ^2. Both waiting times and jumps are homogeneous in space, i.e. parameters do not depend on t. The space-time random walk then has transition kernel

$$K^\tau(x; dz \times dw) = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_\tau(dz) + \delta_{-\tau}(dz)) \frac{\alpha(x)\, dw}{\Gamma(1 - \alpha(x))\tau^{1/\alpha(x)}(1 + w\tau^{-1/\alpha(x)})^{1+\alpha(x)}}, \tag{6.8}$$

and in the limit $\tau \to 0$ this yields the coefficients

$$a = 1, \qquad b = 0, \qquad \gamma = 0, \qquad K(x; dz \times dw) = \frac{\alpha(x)\, dw}{\Gamma(1 - \alpha(x)) w^{1+\alpha(x)}} \delta_0(dz). \tag{6.9}$$

In [34], a discrete lattice was considered on the bounded interval $(0, 1)$, with reflecting boundary conditions. It has been found that in the long-time limit the CTRW limit process is localized at the lattice point x_M at which $\alpha(x)$ attains its minimum, a phenomenon called "anomalous aggregation". The above provides a continuum setting for the work in [34], and it is an interesting open problem to confirm that localization persists in continuous space. The backward and forward governing equations for the CTRW limit are then the fractional differential equations of variable order. The backward equation is written as

$$\frac{\partial^{\alpha(x)}}{\partial(-s)^{\alpha(x)}} P_{s,t}f(x) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} P_{s,t}f(x) + f(x)\frac{(t-s)^{-\alpha(x)}}{\Gamma(1-\alpha(x))}, \qquad P_{t,t}f(x) = f(x). \tag{6.10}$$

The memory kernel $\mathcal{M}$ in forward equation is symbolically written as the fractional derivative of variable order $\frac{\partial^{1-\alpha(x)}}{\partial t^{1-\alpha(x)}}$.

Acknowledgements. The author thanks Professors Meerschaert and Mandrekar for fruitful discussions.

References

[1] R. Metzler and J. Klafter. The random walk's guide to anomalous diffusion: a fractional dynamics approach. *Phys. Rep.*, 339(1):1–77, December 2000.

[2] M J Saxton and K Jacobson. Single-particle tracking: applications to membrane dynamics. *Annual review of biophysics and biomolecular structure*, 26:373–99, January 1997.

[3] E. Scalas. Five years of continuous-time random walks in econophysics. *Complex Netw. Econ. Interact.*, 567:3–16, 2006.

[4] B. Berkowitz, A. Cortis, M. Dentz, and H. Scher. Modeling non-Fickian transport in geological formations as a continuous time random walk. *Rev. Geophys.*, 44(2):1–49, 2006.

[5] E. Barkai, R. Metzler, and J. Klafter. From continuous time random walks to the fractional Fokker-Planck equation. *Phys. Rev. E*, 61(1):132, January 2000.

[6] Marjorie G Hahn, Kei Kobayashi, and Sabir Umarov. SDEs Driven by a Time-Changed Lévy Process and Their Associated Time-Fractional Order Pseudo-Differential Equations. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, May 2010.

[7] Marjorie G Hahn, Kei Kobayashi, and Sabir Umarov. Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equations associated with time-changed fractional Brownian motion. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 139(2):691–705, 2011.

[8] B. Baeumer and M.M. Meerschaert. Stochastic solutions for fractional Cauchy problems. *Frac. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, 4(4):481–500, 2001.

[9] M.M. Meerschaert and A. Sikorskii. *Stochastic Models for Fractional Calculus*. De Gruyter, 2012.

[10] M.M. Meerschaert and H.-P. Scheffler. Limit theorems for continuous-time random walks with infinite mean waiting times. *J. Appl. Prob.*, 638(October 2002):623–638, 2004.

[11] P. Kern, M.M. Meerschaert, and H.-P. Scheffler. Limit theorems for coupled continuous time random walks. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(1):730–756, 2004.

[12] M.M. Meerschaert and H.-P. Scheffler. Triangular array limits for continuous time random walks. *Stoch. Process. Appl.*, 118(9):1606–1633, September 2008.

[13] a. Jurlewicz, P. Kern, M.M. Meerschaert, and H.-P. Scheffler. Fractional governing equations for coupled random walks. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 64(10):3021–3036, October 2011.

[14] B.I. Henry, T.A.M. Langlands, and P. Straka. Fractional Fokker-Planck Equations for Subdiffusion with Space- and Time-Dependent Forces. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 105(17), October 2010.

[15] M. Magdziarz, A. Weron, and J. Klafter. Equivalence of the Fractional Fokker-Planck and Subordinated Langevin Equations: The Case of a Time-Dependent Force. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 101(21):1–4, November 2008.

[16] T.A.M. A M Langlands and B.I. Henry. Fractional chemotaxis diffusion equations. *Phys. Rev. E*, 81(5):1–12, May 2010.

[17] A. Weron and M. Magdziarz. Modeling of subdiffusion in space-time-dependent force fields beyond the fractional Fokker-Planck equation. *Phys. Rev. E*, 77(3):1–6, March 2008.

[18] Els Heinsalu, Marco Patriarca, I Goychuk, and Peter Hänggi. Use and Abuse of a Fractional Fokker-Planck Dynamics for Time-Dependent Driving. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 99(12):1–4, September 2007.

[19] Vassili N Kolokoltsov. Generalized Continuous-Time Random Walks, Subordination by Hitting Times, and Fractional Dynamics. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 53(4):594, 2009.

[20] P. Straka and B.I. Henry. Lagging and leading coupled continuous time random walks, renewal times and their joint limits. *Stoch. Process. Appl.*, 121(2):324–336, February 2011.

[21] E.W. Montroll and G.H. Weiss. Random walks on lattices. II. *J. Math. Phys.*, 6(2):167–181, 1965.

[22] K. Weron, A. Jurlewicz, M. Magdziarz, A. Weron, and J. Trzmiel. Overshooting and undershooting subordination scenario for fractional two-power-law relaxation responses. *Phys. Rev. E*, 81(4):1–7, April 2010.

[23] Ward Whitt. *Stochastic-Process Limits: An Introduction to Stochastic-Process Limits and their Application to Queues (Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering).* Springer, New York, 1st edition, November 2001.

[24] D. Applebaum. *Lévy Processes and Stochastic Calculus (Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics)*, volume 116 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics.* Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition, May 2009.

[25] J. Jacod and A.N. Shiryaev. *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes.* Springer, December 2002.

[26] J. Bertoin. Subordinators: examples and applications. *Lect. Probab. Theory Stat.*, pages 1–91, 2004.

[27] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of Modern Probability.* Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer, New York, January 2002.

[28] B. Maisonneuve. Changement de temps d'un processus markovien additif. *Séminaire de Probabilités XI*, pages 529–538, 1977.

[29] Wolfgang Arendt, Charles J K Batty, Matthias Hieber, and Frank Neubrander. *Vector-valued Laplace transforms and Cauchy problems*, volume 96 of *Monographs in Mathematics.* Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2001.

[30] K. Bichteler, J.B. Gravereaux, and J. Jacod. *Malliavin Calculus for Processes with Jumps.* 1987.

[31] Stewart N. Ethier and Thomas G. Kurtz. *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence (Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics).* Wiley-Interscience, 2nd edition, September 2005.

[32] J. Klafter, Alexander Blumen, and Michael F Shlesinger. Stochastic pathway to anomalous diffusion. *Physical Review A*, 35(7):3081–3085, 1987.

[33] M. Magdziarz, Wadysaw Szczotka, and Piotr ebrowski. Langevin Picture of Lévy Walks and Their Extensions. *J. Stat. Phys.*, March 2012.

[34] Sergei Fedotov and Steven Falconer. Subdiffusive master equation with space-dependent anomalous exponent and structural instability. *Physical Review E*, 85(3):1–6, March 2012.

Peter Straka, School of Mathematics, University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, United Kingdom

E-mail address: `peter.straka@manchester.ac.uk`